

I am writing to ask you to consider the long-term interests vs. short-term interests of Sinclair Broadcasting, as well as the public. The unconscionable intrusion of Sinclair Broadcasting into the democratic process to present a purely partisan program in order to swing a Presidential election calls into question its right to use the public airwaves.

while Sinclair may get its way in the short term, with FCC help, such a course of action will provide a powerful rallying cry that is likely to result in much tighter regulation of Sinclair and other conglomerates over the long-term, as well as constrain the FCC itself. There are a number of historical precedents for this phenomena, as I'm sure FCC staff are aware.

Those at the top levels of Sinclair's corporate policy-making should heed the voices within the company who have brought this very issue to the table recently. Sinclair, and the FCC, ignore them at peril to the companies, their shareholders, and the FCC itself.

Sinclair's decision to force stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

The license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.